



Docket No.: 103-1002

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:

Soo Sang YANG et al.

Application	10/749,394	Group Art Unit:	2838
Filed:	January 2, 2004	Examiner	Fantu, Yalkew
Customer No.:	38209	Confirmation No.	2854

For: CHARGING APPARATUS USED WITH A MOBILE ROBOT

Mail Stop Issue Fee
Commissioner for patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.104**

Sir:

The Examiner provided a Statement of Reason for Allowance in the Notice of Allowance and Fee Due, mailed February 21, 2007, in which the Examiner indicated that "the prior art does not disclose or suggest the following Claims 1, 10 and 28 limitations: '... a body comprising insulating material, and a head movably coupled to-the body., and having a contact plate mounted on a predetermined portion of the head to be brought into electrical contact with contact terminals.' in combination with the remaining claims elements as set forth in Claims 1, 10 and 28 and its depending claims 2-9,11-27 and 31-32. Therefore claims 1-28 and 31 and 32 are allowed."

As specified in MPEP 1302.14, "care must be taken to ensure that such reasons are accurate, precise, and do not place unwarranted interpretations, whether broad or narrow, upon the claims." It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's Statement is not an accurate quote with respect to each of the allowed claims, and instead, raises "possible misinterpretations, and possible estoppel effects" (MPEP 1302.04) and accordingly, should be disregarded.

The Examiner's statement appears to unnecessarily limit the claims to, for example, while claim 1 recites a body comprising an insulating material, claims 10 and 28 do not recite the insulating material of claim 1, and while claim 1 recites contact terminals, claim 10 does not recite the contact terminals. While being useful in understanding the invention, the Examiner's comments could lead to an unwarranted and unnecessary narrowing interpretation of the claims. Therefore, it is further submitted that the claims should not be interpreted based on the Examiner's statement.

It is further submitted that the claims are not constrained by such device limitations and that the claims speaks for themselves as to what features are included therein and are their own best evidence as to the reasons for allowance of same.

STANZIONE & KIM, LLP

Dated: April 24, 2007
919 18th St., NW, Suite 440
Washington, D.C. 20006
Telephone: (202) 775-1900
Facsimile: (202) 775-1901

By: 
Seungman Kim
Registration No. 50,012